



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/577,554	08/09/2007	Francois Moutel	1032326-000393	2258

21839 7590 08/11/2010  
BUCHANAN, INGERSOLL & ROONEY PC  
POST OFFICE BOX 1404  
ALEXANDRIA, VA 22313-1404

EXAMINER
----------

PHAN, THIEM D

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

3729

NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
-------------------	---------------

08/11/2010

ELECTRONIC

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

ADIPFDD@bipc.com  
offserv@bipc.com



### **DETAILED ACTION**

1. The amendment filed on 05/21/10 has been fully considered and made of record.

#### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

3. Claims 2- 3, 5-9 and 15, are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Yen (US 6,744,634) in view of Tetaka et al (US 6,159,770).

**Regarding claim 15**, Yen teaches a process of making low height USB interface, comprising:

- forming a printed circuit package (Fig. 11, 202) having microcircuits defining USB-format contact pads (111) and carrying an electronic component (202A) connected to the pads, and
- in a single operation, increasing the thickness of a cut-out portion of printed circuit package (202) through sandwiching between two casings (113 & 114) while having the microcircuit at least in the area (Fig. 8, 300A) of the contact pads, so as to have a total thickness combined with layer (113) that conforms to the USB Standard (Col. 3, lines 56-60); which reads on applicants' claimed invention, except for having the printed circuit package cut out from a tape having a plurality of microcircuit packages.

Art Unit: 3729

Tetaka et al teach a method of fabricating semiconductor devices with the printed circuit having microcircuit of semiconductor devices, including the cutting out (Fig. 179A, 486) from a tape (Fig. 173A, items 412 & 432) having a plurality of microcircuit packages (412), a portion of the tape (473) including one of the microcircuit packages (412), in order to facilitate the handling and the automated assembling of theses microcircuit packages to a system (Col. 25, lines 20-24).

It would be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the method of Yen by applying the microcircuits mounted on the tape, as taught by Yen and not its general structure, in order to facilitate the handling and the automated assembling of theses microcircuit packages to a system such as the USB Interface key.

**Regarding claim 2,** Yen teaches the disposing of a casing comprising at least one bottom half-shell (Fig. 6, 113) at least under the contact pads.

**Regarding claim 3,** Yen teaches the interfitting of the bottom half-shell (Fig. 6, 113) with a top half-shell (112) covering a zone of the microcircuit that lies outside the contact pads (111).

**Regarding claim 5,** Yen teaches the forming of an overmolded portion (Fig. 11, 114 & 113A) over the microcircuit (202).

**Regarding claim 6,** Yen teaches the fastening of the microcircuit (Fig. 11, 202) to the bottom shell (113).

**Regarding claim 7,** Tetaka et al teach the insulative adhesive (Fig. 46, 115) to fix a chip (111) and it would be obvious to apply this adhesive to fix the microcircuit to the bottom shell while insulating it.

**Regarding claim 8,** Yen teaches that the electronic component (Fig. 11, 202A) is disposed at a location (113A) offset from a location of the contact pads (111).

**Regarding claim 9,** Tetaka et al teach that the electronic component (Fig. 116, 311) is disposed on the same top face of the microcircuit as the contact pads (315) and it would be obvious to apply this structure to Yen to accommodate further electronic component to the circuit.

4. Claim 4 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Yen in view of Tetaka et al and further view of Lin et al (US 6,676,419).

**Regarding claim 4,** Yen in view of Tetaka et al teach a process of making USB interface with a microcircuit; which reads on applicants' claimed invention, except for inserting the microcircuit into a shell having an access (213) on a rear edge.

Lin et al teach a process of fabricating a portable storing device with USB interface by inserting the microcircuit (Fig. 3, 24) into a shell (21 & 22) having an access on a rear edge in order to have a stabilized structure of forward and backward position of the contact terminal (Col. 1, lines 42-47).

It would be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the method of Yen in view of Tetaka et al by applying the design of forward or backward movement of contact terminal, as taught by Lin et al and not its general structure, in order to avoid the cost of the top switch (Fig. 8, 202C) and the unreliable contact cover (Fig. 14, 301) which tends to be lost and to permanently expose the contacts (Fig. 12, 111) and to have a

Art Unit: 3729

stabilized structure of forward and backward position of the contact embedded in the circuit board (Fig. 12, 202).

### ***Response to Arguments***

5. Applicants' arguments filed on 05/21/10 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive for the following reasons:

With respect to the applicants' remarks on page 4 about the claimed limitation of the tape (Fig. 2, 54) and the one piece shell (Fig. 10) not taught by the prior art and in response to these remarks, the examiner needs to emphasize that although the claims are interpreted in light of the specification, limitations from the specification are not read into the claims, which are judged with their broadest reasonable interpretation. (See MPEP 2111 and *In re Geuns*, 26 USPQ 2d 1057 (Fed. Cir. 1993)).

With respect to applicants' remarks on page 5, the prior art Tetaka et al teach the serially attached items (Fig. 173A, items 412 & 432) to be construed as a tape sandwiched between two layers (Fig. 179A, 463 & 473) and to be cut out (Fig. 179A, 486) where the separated tape portion is construed as the one with microcircuit package (412). Regarding the amended limitation of increasing the thickness to conform to USB standard, Yen teaches the increasing of the thickness of a cut-out portion of printed circuit package (202) through sandwiching between two casings (113 & 114) while having the microcircuit at least in the area (Fig. 8, 300A) of the contact pads, so as to have a total thickness combined with layer (113) that conforms to the USB Standard (Col. 3, lines 56-60).

Art Unit: 3729

Claims 2-9 stand as carefully processed in sections 3 and 4 above, and in view of the response to the applicants' arguments above.

***Conclusion***

6. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicants' disclosure.

Applicants' amendment necessitated the new grounds of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicants are reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Tim Phan whose telephone number is 571-272-4568. The examiner can normally be reached on M & Tu, 6AM - 2PM, and W & Th, 9AM – 5PM.

Art Unit: 3729

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Derris Banks can be reached on 571-272-4419. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

/Phan Thiem/  
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 3729

August 9, 2010